

Applicant: David P. Prince  
U.S.S.N.: 10/784,118

### **REMARKS**

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the Office action on January 25, 2004 with the Applicant's attorney.

In response to the Office action mailed November 19, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of the application, claims 14 and 21 are amended. Claims 9-13 and 19 are canceled without prejudice to their patentability. Claims 9-13 were previously withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 14-18 and 20-25 remain pending, of which claims 1, 14, 20 and 21 are in independent form. The application as presented is believed to be in allowable condition.

Applicant affirms the election of the Group I claims made by the Examiner in the Office action, and, as a result, canceled claims 9-13.

Applicant has amended claim 14 to remove the double patenting rejection made by the Examiner in the Office action. Specifically, claim 14 is amended to include the method step of "actuating a stencil wipe procedure to clean the stencil when a defect exists in the region of interest" as set forth in claim 19. This feature is not claimed in co-pending application no. 10/734,395, and is submitted as defining patentably over the prior art of record for the reasons provided below. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the allowance of claims 1-8 and 20 by the Examiner in the Office action.

Claims 21-25 are rejected in the Office action as being obvious and unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Doyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,873,939) in view of Takagi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,801,965).

As amended, claim 21 is directed to a method of dispensing material at predetermined locations through a stencil and onto an electronic substrate. The method comprises:

- dispensing the material through the stencil and onto the substrate;
- performing texture-based recognition of a predetermined location of the material on the stencil;
- determining whether there is at least one feature in the predetermined location on the stencil;

Applicant: David P. Prince  
U.S.S.N.: 10/784,118

comparing the at least one feature on the stencil with a position of the substance on the substrate to determine whether the at least one feature is a defect; and

***actuating a stencil wipe procedure to clean the stencil when the at least one feature is determined to be a defect.***

As asserted by the Examiner, Doyle et al. disclose dispensing material through the stencil on to the substrate. The Examiner further asserts that Takagi et al. disclose a texture-based recognition for detecting defects. The Examiner's position is that although Doyle et al. and Takagi et al. fail to disclose the stencil wipe procedure upon detecting a defect, this claimed feature would have been obvious based on teachings in the field of lithography to clean the stencil.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no teaching in the prior art of record of a method comprising the step of actuating a stencil wipe procedure to clean the stencil when detecting a defect. It is well-known in the art to perform a stencil wipe after performing a predetermined number of print operations (e.g., ten prints) or during printer down time. *See* Brochure, DEK Printing Machines Ltd., "DEK 265GSx Engineering Specification," Issue 01, 10 January 1996, p. 23. However, it is novel and non-obvious to perform such a stencil wipe in response to detecting a defect from the prior print operation.

Thus, claim 21 is submitted as non-obvious and patentable over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Claims 22-25, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 21, are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Applicant: David P. Prince  
U.S.S.N.: 10/784,118

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, the application is believed to be in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, he is invited to contact the Applicants' Attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith F. Noe, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,686)  
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP  
Riverfront Office Park  
One Main Street  
Cambridge, MA 02142  
Tel.: (617) 395-7039  
Fax: (617) 395-7070  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: February 3, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: M2010-7128

757264.1